REMARKS

Claims 1-74 are pending. Claims 34 and 44-74 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Accordingly, claims 1-33 and 35-43 are under examination in the above-identified application. Claim 1 has been amended above. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the application and, for example, at page 36, lines 16-31. Accordingly, the amendments do not raise an issue of new matter and entry thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant has review the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed December 15, 2003, and respectfully traverse all grounds for the reasons that follow.

With regard to the maintenance of the restriction and election of species requirement, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and rejoinder of some or all of the groups of claims. As set forth in Applicant's previous response, examination of the some or all of the groups of claims does not pose a serious burden on the Examiner. If the Examiner decides upon reconsideration that the restriction is to be maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a "second-eye review" as now implemented under the Restriction Practice Action Plan. Under the Action Plan, rejoinder practice is viewed favorably when examination of claims together would not pose a serious burden on the Examiner.

interview Summary OK CLS 8/17/04

Applicant would like to thank Examiners Smith and Marschel for extending a personal interview with Applicant's representatives on March 24, 2004. As recorded in the Interview Summary, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 102 were discussed. The amendments above and remarks below are believed by Applicant to substantially conform to the subject matter discussed during the interview. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Objection to the Title

The title has been objected to allegedly because it fails to be clearly indicative of the claimed invention. The Office asserts that the title is directed to multiparameter integration methods for the analysis of biological networks, whereas in contrast the claims are directed to a method of predicting a behavior of a biochemical system.